



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/550,726	04/17/2000	Paul A. Revis	M00-031500	1485

22835 7590 02/02/2004

PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
508 SECOND STREET  
SUITE 201  
DAVIS, CA 95616

EXAMINER

LUDWIG, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 02/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/550,726

Applicant(s)

REVIS, PAUL A.

Examiner

Matthew J. Ludwig

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment A filed 11/20/03.
2. Claims 1-45 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 30, and 38 are independent claims.
3. The rejection of claims 1-45 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham et al. has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham et al. U.S. Patent Number 6,457,026 filed (9/13/00) in view of Marimont et al. U.S. Patent Number 5,809,179 filed (5/31/96).

**In reference to independent claim 1, Graham teaches:**

- User may scroll through document by sliding emphasized area up and down. As emphasized area shifts, the section of document displayed in first viewing area will also shift (compare to "user inputs the command to display the full bitmap version of the image" and "retrieving and displaying the full bitmap version of the image"). See column 8, lines 57-62. The reference demonstrates a similar technique of a user utilizing a mouse to input a command in a separate window and upon entering a command, the section of the document in the second document retrieving and displaying information based on the user's input command.

- An elongated thumbnail image of many pages, or all of document is presented in second viewing area. Document will typically be a multi-page document with a section being displayed in first viewing area. See column 8, lines 33-40. Graham illustrates in Figure 2A, (as presently claimed), image in a second window view that represent outlines of shapes that are present in the full bitmap version demonstrate images within a web environment. The reference does not explicitly disclose a line drawing version used in place of the graphical image in the graphical presentation. However, Marimont teaches an accurately rendered image version of an original image, which is an image that illustrates image regions and represents perceptually distinguishable image regions *of the original image*. The reference further discloses the rendered image resembling a *line drawing* of the edges in the original image. See column 4, lines 43-57. Finally, the reference discloses the advantages of a compact image representation achieved without significant loss of image information content. See column 7, lines 33-40. Marimont provides a reasonable suggestion of line drawings and the representation of images utilizing said line drawings. The drawings contain a reduced amount of data and would not consume a processors speed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Graham and Marimont before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the image selection methods taught by Graham and include the line drawing techniques of Marimont, because it would have provided smaller file size representations for larger views and alternate representations of images within a web environment.

**In reference to dependent claim 2, Graham teaches:**

Figure 6A shows that the source of document may be accessed via a network. Possible sources include e.g., the Internet, an intranet, a digital copier that captures document images, or other office equipment. See column 5, lines 17-24.

**In reference to dependent claim 3, Graham teaches:**

User may scroll through document by sliding emphasized area up and down. As emphasized area shifts, the section of document displayed in first viewing area will also shift. See column 8, lines 57-60.

**In reference to dependent claim 4, Graham teaches:**

An elongated thumbnail image of many pages, or all of document is presented in second viewing area. Document will typically be a multi-page document with a section being displayed in first viewing area. See column 33-39. The reference demonstrates two separate windows consisting of two different sets of images within pages of a document.

**In reference to dependent claim 5, Graham teaches:**

Elongated thumbnail image provides a convenient view of the basic document structure. The annotations incorporated into the document are visible within elongated thumbnail images. See column 8, lines 37-41.

**In reference to dependent claim 6, the claim recites similar limitations to those of independent claim 1, and therefore is rejected under similar rationale.**

**In reference to dependent claim 7, Graham teaches:**

Figure 6A shows that the source of document may be accessed via a network. Possible sources include e.g., the Internet, an intranet, a digital copier that captures document images, or other office equipment. See column 5, lines 17-24.

In reference to claims 8-14, the claims recite the computer executable instructions for carrying out the methods of claims 1-7, and therefore are rejected under similar rationale.

In reference to claims 15-21, the claims recite the apparatus for carrying out the methods of claims 1-7, and therefore are rejected under similar rationale.

**In reference to independent claim 22, Graham teaches:**

Elongated thumbnail image displays each page of document as being displayed at the same reduced scale. An elongate thumbnail image of many pages, or all of document is presented in second viewing area. See column 8, lines 32-67. The reference demonstrates the utilization of images within a document and thumbnails that are produced from the original images within the structure of a document.

The reference does not explicitly state that the second window, which provides a reduced view of the document section currently displayed, requires less data to be retrieved; however, the reduced image taught by Graham, demonstrates a similar method as presently claimed.

Thumbnails within a web environment require less data to be retrieved than displaying the full bitmap version of the actual image. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have modified the methods taught by Graham and utilized the thumbnail techniques to give the user an efficient means of finding information anywhere in the document.

**In reference to dependent claim 23, Graham teaches:**

An elongate thumbnail image of many pages, or all of document is presented in second viewing area. Document will typically be a multi-page document with a section being displayed in first viewing area. See column 8, lines 33-40. Figure 6A shows that the source of document may be accessed via a network. Possible sources include e.g., the Internet, an intranet, a digital copier that captures document images, or other office equipment. See column 5, lines 17-24.

**In reference to dependent claim 24**, Graham teaches:

User may scroll through document by sliding emphasized area up and down. As emphasized area shifts, the section of document displayed in first viewing area will also shift (compare to “user inputs the command to display the full bitmap version of the image” and “retrieving and displaying the full bitmap version of the image”). See column 8, lines 57-62. The reference demonstrates a similar technique of a user utilizing a mouse to input a command in a separate window and upon entering a command, the section of the document in the second document retrieving and displaying information based on the user’s input command.

In reference to dependent claims 25-29, the claims recite similar limitations to the methods of claims 1-7, and therefore are rejected under similar rationale.

In reference to claims 30-45, the limitations recite the computer executable instructions followed by the apparatus for carrying out the methods of claims 22-29, and therefore are rejected under similar rationale.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-45 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

It is respectfully noted that applicant's incorporation of newly formed limitations into independent claim 1, changes the scope of the claim's limitations when interpreted as a whole. Therefore, the instant rejections have been adjusted accordingly.

Applicant argues on pages 15 & 16 of the amendment that the reference does not teach or suggest the limitations of claim 1. Applicant further states that Graham does not disclose a line drawing version of a graphical image to be used *in place of* a full bitmap image of the graphical image. The newly added limitations required a new search and adjustment of the rejection of argued independent claim 1.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

***Conclusion***

Danisewicz

USPN 6,233,353

filed (1/29/99)




Art Unit: 2178

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 703-305-8043. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

ML  
January 15, 2004



**STEPHEN S. HONG**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**